

IEP Tidal Wetlands Monitoring Project Work Team Notes

July 29, 2015

9:00 – 12:00

DWR – West Sacramento – Room 106

DFW- Alice Low, Stacy Sherman, Rosie Hartman, Dave Contreras, Tim Stevens, Hildie Spautz
DWR – Randy Mager, Eric Loboschefskey, Steve San Julian, Gina Benigno, Joy Khamphanh, Caitlin Roddy, Anitra Pawley (phone), Pascale Goertler, Krista Hoffmann, Gina Darin, Gardner Jones
SFEI - April Robinson
DSP – Karen Kayfetz, Maggie Chrisman
DSC – Daniel Huang
USGS - Larry Brown
MWD – Shawn Acuna
ESA - Ramona Swenson
SFCWA - Kelsey Cowin
USFWS - Heather Swinney, Susie Tharratt
Bruce Herbold

1. Introductions/Housekeeping

Review of meeting notes – June 2015

- No comments

Agenda review

2. Beginning Comments

- April Robinson wants to put together a small primary productivity workshop to work on estimating historical and modern estuarine productivity (part of the Delta Landscapes project) and would like someone from the IEP Tidal Wetland PWT. The work shop will take place Oct. 28-30.
 - A presentation of what came out of the primary productivity workshop will occur at a future IEP Tidal Wetland PWT meeting.
 - Rosemary Hartman will represent the PWT.
- There is concern that this Tidal Wetland PWT team is going off track from its mission statement. The concern is that this group will be setting regulatory decisions.
 - **The IEP PWT tidal wetland team does not have any authority in setting regulatory decisions**
 - All restorations have objectives and all projects will have the power to say yes or no to our metrics.
 - The FRP program should develop a bulleted “fact sheet” to point out what the task of the IEP tidal wetland PWT team is and isn’t. This can be put on the IEP Tidal Wetland PWT webpage

- The FRP team will draft and send this out to the team along with the mission statement
 - An issue with these PWT teams is the connection between science and whether they meet the criteria of the biological opinion
 - That is not the focus of this PWT team, but it can inform that process
 - All of the hypotheses address whether the question is supported and not if the wetland is successful
- 3. Data Management and Reporting – New Subteam
 - There is a gap in the monitoring plan for data management.
 - We would like input on how can we share data, make standardized report cards, data standards
 - Volunteers for the subteam include: Maggie Chrisman, Hildie Spautz, and Shawn Acuna. Kris Jones was volunteered to join this subteam.
 - Contact Rosie (Rosemary.Hartman@wildlife.ca.gov) if you are interested in joining.
- 4. Updates from Subteam Meetings
 - Revising hypotheses
 - The fish subteam found some wording issues with hypotheses, mostly in the wording of comparing to “pre-project and reference sites”, and in certain clauses that were not testable.
 - In the fish subteam it was suggested to cut hypothesis S5 “Non-native fish, gelatinous zooplankton, and shrimp competition with and predation on at-risk fish species will reduce survival and growth of at-risk fishes on-site compared to pre-project conditions” because it hard to find whether non-natives will affect at-risk fish species due to competition and predation.
 - This hypothesis is somewhat captured by at-risk fish condition
 - It may be helpful to place special studies hypothesis that are removed into another section to show what the team considered it
 - Consensus from the team is that it’s ok to cut, but perhaps to place it as a sub-hypothesis special study under S4.
 - For S1 and similar hypotheses, is it ok to cut out some of the language
 - No consensus was reached, but the FRP team will re-write some of the hypotheses that will be sent out to the team for review and approval
 - Analyses
 - This topic was not addressed during the meeting
- 5. Criteria Weighting for Decision Tool
 - Rosie presented a PowerPoint on the decision tool
 - There is concern that each program’s objective will be different and the weighting will change from project to project

- This tool is being developed as a starting point for projects and all projects can pick and choose their hypotheses rather than use the list of metrics generated by the tool.
- Perhaps a version of this tool can be given to agencies with examples so they can fill it out themselves to suit their own requirements/limitations

Criteria Discussion

- An excel format is a good way to visually examine the criteria
- For permits change to 3 for no permits/incidental take, 2 for non lethal take, 1 for lethal take, and 0 both USFWS and NMFS permit required
- Try to lump # of people and training into one category
- Include a time sampling component such as sampling during spring tides or first flush
- Try to lump Precision and Accuracy into one category
- Time till data should be included as a criterion (ie a study takes 5 years to get data to work with)
- Can safety be folded into some of the definitions of the criteria?
 - Yes, this will be incorporated under training.
- Contractors should not be brought into the definitions for training due to differences in each department's purchasing method

6. Conceptual Model Text – Please Review

- Please Review by mid-August

7. Comparison Site Monitoring

- For many of the hypotheses the “comparison” wording should be looked at
 - For P1 – the “will change compared to pre-project conditions” should be fine because it provides context, but the team could not reach a consensus.
 - For P2 - Perhaps add another hypothesis for quality of habitat is as good or better than existing comparison site
 - Maybe have temporal or spatial component to these hypotheses with an anecdote emphasizing temporal and spatial comparison
 - Maybe word the hypotheses so that they only need to monitor their site with the option to compare with other wetland sites
 - Perhaps just have temporal comparisons, spatial comparisons, temporal and spatial conditions, instead of pre-project/reference sites.

8. Last Questions and Comments

- Is there a due date for the generalized monitoring plan?
 - No due date was given but sections are fairly well drafted and may be distributed
- For conceptual models the text needs to be withered down for publication for SFEWS

- Perhaps the end of September for the technical final version
- After the PWT finishes the task of the general monitoring program, we need an objective to continue PWT meetings. Reviewing and advising on site-specific monitoring plans, and synthesizing data were suggested as long-term objectives.